



WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1851.

## SOUTHERN AGITATION.

Our brother editor of the Southern Advocate refers with keen feeling to the disagreements between portions of the Southern M. E. Church, and hints some quite suspicious looking ideas about local re-organizations. In referring to possible Northern changes, he remarks:—“And what harm will ensue, we ask, to the cause of religion in the Annual Conferences which may find themselves shut up to this necessity, provided such organization maintains its loyalty to the great cardinal principles of doctrine and discipline which characterized the primitive fellowship? None upon earth we can see. The very growth of the original body, without the occurrence of the extraneous causes aforementioned, would have rendered, in the course of time, some such subdivisions desirable.” The Richmond Advocate dislikes much these sentiments as applicable to the South, for which they thinks they were designed. The Southern proceeds:—

“An attentive spectator of the drift of things may have discerned in the procedures of our own General Conference, causes of complaint, actual grievances, in particular directions. We need not specify here. We desire to add no fuel to the excitement already existing, no exasperation to the fever already at the fever point. As lovers of the church, earnestly seeking her peace and prosperity, we are bound, however, to say, that in the religious confederacy as in the political, quiet, harmony and continued union and prosperity must be sought in confining the general government strictly within the limits of constitutional law. The equality of Annual Conferences must be maintained, by a rigid abstinen from all legislation which profits one at the expense of another; or which interferes with the internal management of bodies co-ordinate each in the system, and undivided only for interests common to all.”

Upon this the Richmond editor remarks: “We are conscious of no disposition to misinterpret the sentiments avouched in this passage; and to avoid doing so, we will not attempt either to name it, or to define its meaning. We refer to it more in grief than in anger. But as one of the signs of the times we do not feel entirely at liberty to omit all reference to it. It may be justifiable upon grounds that identify the General and State Governments in our National Confederacy with the General and Annual Conferences in our ecclesiastical regime. It may be vindicable upon the ground of necessity in redressing ‘causes of complaint,’ and ‘actual grievances in particular directions.’ Or, it may be explicable as a prognostic of the ‘particular directions’ a certain political disease, just now extensively prevailing in Southern latitudes, if it should assume an ecclesiastical type, will take. ‘Coming events cast their shadows before.’ Is this the shadow of a coming event? We sincerely hope better things.”

For our own part we heartily deprecate such apprehensions of disunion in our cause. We do not think they are well founded in the North or South. We should rather contend for a little more candid freedom of opinion, and not assume a menacing brow and talk of running if we cannot accord with each other in all opinions. There is something small and even puerile in this course. Each section of the church should be supplied with its local organ, and all agree in fundamental Methodism, while all accord the privilege of liberal discussion and variation on other subjects. It is an anomalous fact that our border brethren have not an organ of their own. It would be a relief to them and all the rest of the church if they had one.

## METHODISM IN NEW ENGLAND.

The New England correspondent of the Western Christian Advocate gives some interesting calculations from the late Minutes respecting Methodism in the Eastern States. He says: “According to the ‘Minutes of the Annual Conferences,’ just published, we have in New England 56,981 members, and 8,659 probationers; making in both 65,640. This gives more than one thousand and increase each year, beside the vast number that have gone to heaven since Lee’s visit to New England. We have, also, 646 travelling and 457 local preachers. Thirty years ago we had not a literary institution among us; now we have a university, second to none in the country in furnishing all the advantages of a thorough scholarship; and which, we are happy to say, is in a prosperous state; six Conference academical institutions, all doing well, beside several other literary institutions under the control and patronage of the church; and bids fair to prove an incalculable blessing to the church. Sixty years ago we had but two small chapels in New England; now may be seen a neat Methodist Church in nearly every town, and in most of our large villages, and all our cities are well supplied with church edifices. Many of our churches are large and commodious, and in architecture will compare favorably with any in the country. We have, it is supposed, between forty and fifty thousand children in our Sunday Schools, most of whom are taught by persons enjoying the love of God. And we are happy to say that the work of God is going on gloriously among us. There are more or less revivals in every Conference, and the work is evidently spreading in every direction. Last year was a glorious one; our increase in the membership, including the local preachers, was 4,186. ‘To God be all the glory!’ There is one capital inaccuracy, we suppose, in this estimate; it does not include the New York and the Troy Conferences, most of which lay within New England—a fact that would swell materially the New England Methodist statistics. Methodism in the Eastern States is sometimes disparagingly referred to as a distance, but in no part of the country has it had greater struggle or more signal success. And in no other are its essentials more prized. It has advanced here beyond all other sections of the church in its supply of substantial chapels and literary provisions, and its foundations rest nowhere more firmly than on this Puritan soil.”

## NEW METHODIST PAPER.

The Michigan Advocate is the title of a new and exceedingly spirited little sheet, the first number of which has just reached us. It is “got out” in neat style, and will evidently do good service to the church. Terms, \$1.25 in advance, \$1.50 in six months. Editor, Rev. J. V. Watson. It takes at once a brave stand on public questions—quoting five columns, on its outside, against the Black Law, and affirming in its prospects the following independent position: “With the affairs of State, with politics, we shall covet no interference. But should the doctrine of any party, or the civil enactments of any legislative body be insulting to religion, or a trespass upon the constitutionally defined rights of our common humanity, we shall not stop to consult expediency, or to calculate consequences, we say fearlessly, but solemnly, to the ‘power that be,’ in the name of Him who permits them to ‘be,’ thus far outgoest them to go and no further.” We shall never interfere in politics only when politics interfere with religion.”

Thus nearly all our papers have fallen into the track which this journal years ago opened among us amidst general denunciations. We believe that the legitimate moral influence of Methodism on public opinion will be realized by its presses. Prudent but unblinking men managing these potent organs, will yet derive a power in our cause, before which public iniquity shall cower. The Michigan Advocate is published at Adrian and Detroit. Address Rev. J. V. Watson, Adrian.

## NOBLY SAID.

Professor Whedon, of the Michigan University, speaks in the following noble strain on the duty of the pulpit: “The pulpit is bound to draw, unflinchingly, the boundary lines of eternal right, across whosoever field or path it cuts. Whenever a great statesman vociferates across the nation that, ‘religion has nothing to do with politics,’ you may be sure there is villainy on foot. No man opens a war against conscience, private or public, unless conscience has some cause of quarrel against him. The man who would say to Christianity, ‘hands off,’ would be glad to say to the Omniscient eye, ‘be shut.’ The political profession would, doubtless, a large share, be very glad to know that over their domains the divine law is suspended; and that Almighty God may not invade their territories. Deeply do I regret to say, that the

## Correspondence.

## NEW YORK CITY CORRESPONDENCE.

The World’s Fair in London—Ship of the Line Penney—Vala—Her Coat—Father Taylor—Colonization Cause—Receipts of the N. Y. State Society—Emigrants to Liberia last year—The Line of African Mail Steamers—Its Importance to the Commerce of the United States—Tonnage on the Mediterranean—Steamers from Liverpool to the Ocean—The Liberian Republic, a wonder of the age—well-governed, and worthy of imitation.

New York, Dec. 28, 1850.

Preparations are already making in our city for the World’s Fair in London, and besides exhibitors, many visitors it is thought will go from New York. The steamship *Fredonia* was at first designated for the transportation of American contributions, but has not yet returned from the Pacific. It is now said at Washington, that the Secretary of the Navy will fit out that splendid Leviathan, the *Pennsylvania*, for the purpose, provided Congress will make the adequate appropriation. I hope this will be done; surely it ought to be. The *Ohio*, in Boston, is also named for the trip.

As Americans, we should be proud to see the noblest ship in the navy, and I believe in the world, sailing upon a mission, which will form a new era in the history of man, and mark the benign spirit of our age. To my mind, there is something morally grand and sublime in the reflection, that this mighty ship of war is transformed into a receptacle of the arts of peaceful and happy industry. She conveys them to the World’s Exhibition, and instead of cannon-balls, gunpowder, and boarding pikes, for the murder of our fellow men, the magnificent ship of the line will be freighted down with specimens of American genius, application, and national prosperity. Boston will contribute largely, of course, of her notions. Your Mr. Lawrence, at the Court of St. James, I think, has been requested by the family to prepare a biography of the Bishop. Any person having letters, or other information that might be of service, are desired to communicate with Dr. H., who resides in Nashville, Tenn.

THE CHRISTMAS LOVEFEAST.

It was a beautiful thought that entered the mind of one of the Methodist pastors of this city, and induced him to say, “Let us have a *union Lovefeast* on Christmas night.” This idea was cordially entertained, and the meeting agreed to with an enthusiastic promptitude which gave promise of a glorious feast. The meeting was appointed and held at the Lecture Room of the Bromfield St. Church. Notwithstanding the night was inclement, the assembly was large—so large that many were obliged to stand all the evening. Here were brethren and sisters, young and old, from all our churches in the city, and many from out of town, come together to enjoy a good old-fashioned Methodist Lovefeast; and they were not disappointed. They found what they sought, and even more; they found, if it be possible, that Methodism, with an increase of years, is better than at the beginning; and on this occasion we saw, and heard, too, specimens of Methodism from various climes and latitudes. In the altar were our reverend fathers in the Gospel, Abraham D. Merrill and Edward T. Taylor. Worn and full of scars, still they looked vigorous for toil yet to be endured, and valiant for battles yet to be fought. On their right were a few of the old members of the Methodist churches in Boston. I say a few, for a majority of the primitive stock have passed on to “see the King in his beauty, and to dwell in the land that is very far off”—a land of bloom, and verdure, and harvest fruits, and balmy zephyrs, and flowers, and songs, and thrones, and kingdoms, and the smile of God—a goodly land, and an heavenly, brought very nigh that night by hymns, and prayers, and faith, and Christian fellowship. Peaceful be the slumbers of those good men and women who have gone before us, and blessings on the memory of the just. In front, and on the left, and in the rear, were our strong men and women in middle life, commingled with our promising young people, a glorious company gathered with their master, the Saviour, in the presence of the angels. It was a blessed sight, and many a heart felt

“That angels there were hovering round us.”

Precisely at 7 o’clock, Father Merrill opened the services with singing and prayer, and

“God came down our souls, and glory crowned the meat.”

Father Taylor made the opening remarks, and directed the distribution of the symbols of our Christian love and Methodist fellowship—bread and water; a frail repast of literal things; but the essential elements of the feast were sentiment, song, and hope. The old hero of “North Square” was in his glory, and never appeared braver or more at home among his children of the sea, or on the “quarter deck,” than he did among his brethren, and in the altar on this occasion. He looked weather-beaten and storm-worn, and it was evident that long since he had dispensed with the ornamental rig of his craft, but the old hull, though worse for the wear, showed the “live oak,” the obedient helm, and plenty of “shot in the locker.” It was hourly wise with counsels and ripe experience; and along side was stalwart manhood in his prime, and ready for the hard work of the church; and, close by, and all around, was blooming youth and blushing beauty, full of hope, and promise, and the exultation of early piety. It was a blessed sight, and many a heart felt

“In this view of the matter, I indulge the hope that Congress will pass the bill to establish the African Mail Steamers, of which you made a favorable editorial some time ago. This is a most important measure; I think the most so, that has ever been suggested to promote African colonization. The plan will also really benefit and increase American commerce. Africa and her coast will not only be benefited by this line of steamers, but the trade of the Mediterranean, hourly increasing, will thus be brought under the influence of American enterprise. This trade should not be overruled by our nation. More than two hundred thousand tons were engaged last year between the Mediterranean and the United States. Our exports to the same region were nearly seven millions, and the imports over five millions. At Liverpool, a company has recently been formed to run fifteen steamers over the Mediterranean, and some even to Constantinople! Shall American be behind the age? I have watched the progress of the Colonization scheme, and think more favorably of this benevolent enterprise than ever. A benign Providence has crowned it with such extraordinary success, that I cannot think otherwise. It is not a good rule, never to oppose any scheme, whose end is good, its means lawful, and its motives pure! I look upon the establishment of the little Liberian Republic as one of the most wonderful events of our age. It is governed by colored men, and with as much sound wisdom as can be found in the public councils of any land. In this respect, I wish that our own Congress was more like them.”

DELTA.

LETTER FROM INDIANA.

Saturday—Western Christian Advocate—Our Episcopacy—Temperance—Constitutional Convention.

MR. EDITOR.—As an occasional correspondent from Indiana, I would be glad to give your readers a bird’s eye view of all the news that would interest them. But this I hardly hope to do in the few short letters I write. I must therefore content myself with but a part of my wishes.

You can gather, from the secular press of Indiana, what might be in Father Merrill’s mind, for his face was radiant with joy, and his lips redolent of praises.

He always carries with him a beautiful harp, attuned to some of the best music of redemption. A soul so full of melody will not have to fly to get to heaven. The testimonies on this occasion were delightful and refreshing. The venerable Thomas Patten spoke of his forty years’ connection with Boston Methodism, and while he briefly, but pertinently, referred to the conflicts and labors through which himself and compatriots had passed, our hearts grew warm, and we thanked God for the great things he had done for the fathers, and for us. He stood almost alone. His colleagues had gone to their rest, and he was waiting the summons to pass the “swellings of Jordan.”

“Part of the host had crossed the flood, and part were crossing now.”

These thoughts were inspiring, and while the good old man looked round on the great happy company before him, for the triumph of the church of his choice lit up his countenance, and he seemed not to regret that his warfare was well nigh accomplished. Noah K. Skinner testified to thirty years experience, not only of religion but of the fortunes of our church in the city; and he was full of confidence, and courage, and joy. Thus the fathers. John Borrowdale deplored that nineteen years’ acquaintance with the man that “receives sinners, and with Methodism in Boston, had enabled him to be of ‘Christianity in earnest,’ and he was fully resolved to wear out his vigorous manhood in the service of Christ and the church; and he could then, as is his custom everywhere, ‘bless the good Lord’ for salvation. And so said in effect all the young men, and all who spoke. No time was lost. The dues distilled, the showers descended, the clouds came down; we wept, and praised, and prayed; we looked into each other’s faces with delight, and up to heaven with blessed hope, and in spirit entered to covenant to meet finally in the general assembly and church of the first born.”

This was the best Lovefeast I ever attended, and I doubt if a better one was ever held in Boston. It was good for our churches that it was held, and it must and will be repeated. Our people should come together, and cultivate acquaintances with each other, and thus keep up the good old social character of the Methodists. Quite a number, though not all, of the pastors in the city were present. We shall never forget the *Christmas Lovefeast* in Boston at the close of the first half of the nineteenth century. CORE.

A LEVEE will be held in the Town Hall of Quincy, on Wednesday evening, Jan. 15, for the benefit of the M. E. Church in Quincy Center. Rev. E. T. Taylor, of Boston, and others, are expected to address the company. Tickets 25 cents each. The brother who sends this note says:—“This church is struggling nobly for existence and usefulness. Will our friends help us to throw off our embarrassment by helping us to pay our debts? Methodism in this region is staked upon our success. With a little aid from abroad, our success will be complete.” We hope that many of our Boston brethren will be present; they will enjoy themselves, and help their Quincy brethren.

In private circles the several proposed changes in the Episcopacy are much discussed by the preachers. There seems to be no objection to the plan proposed by the Pittsburgh Advocate. To this is added, by many, a proposition to make the office temporary—that is to elect for a term of years, instead of for life. This seems necessary to complete the analogy between Bishops and other officers of the church. Our Presiding Elders and other officers are subject to change—why may not Bishops be? When superannuated, let them be placed on the superannuated list in the Conference to which they belonged, and be on a par with their superannuated brethren who, in some instances at least, have endured

as many and as severe trials as they, and who now superannuate on a bare claim for quarterage, and this often not all paid! The proposition, as you say of the former, “is at least worthy of reflection and brotherly consultation among us.” To this is, by some, added, a change in the method of supporting them. Why should their whole support—quarterage, table expenses, travelling expenses, &c., all come off of the superannuated and widows? I verily believe this more worthy of reflection than either of the other propositions. A direct contribution, either from the churches or the effective preachers, would be both more just and more humane. This should be thought of seriously, and is much talked of in certain circles in the West. The proposition to make them effective only while really so, received a able notice some weeks ago in the Western Advocate, from a prominent man in Ohio. It seems, indeed, to have been the original design of our fathers, as the Discipline provides for nearly the same thing.

The cause of temperance is advancing in Indiana. There is an united effort against the traffic, with promise of success.

The Convention now in session for revising the Constitution of the State, have taken a vote which indicates that they will prevent colored persons hereafter coming to the State from holding real estate. This is intended to prevent their coming to the State. What favor it will meet with when the vote is taken on the adoption of the Constitution is doubtful. Perhaps a few very popular amendments may carry everything with them.

Rockport, Ind., Nov. 27. T. A. G.

## LETTER FROM GREENFIELD, MASS.

The Church—Adversity—Prosperity—Missions.

BRO. STEVENS.—The public have been informed of the struggles and misfortunes of the Methodist Church in this place, and many doubtless will be glad to hear of her prosperity. At the commencement of the year, pecuniary embarrassments and a long spiritual death had reduced the membership of the church to 32, and dark forebodings cast a gloom over her future prospects. But a brighter day was yet to dawn upon this little band. Early in August, the presence of the Divine Spirit was distinctly recognized in our midst, and the expectation was raised, that the “windows of heaven” were about to be opened. A few attended the “camp meeting” at Southampton, and two were there converted. From that time the interest continued to increase until the 4th of October, when we commenced a protracted meeting, which continued for several weeks. As the result of our efforts, about 30 have been converted and reclaimed, and the church greatly quickened and encouraged. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The Rev. Mr. Partridge, of the Congregational Church, S. H. Reed, Esq., who presided at the meeting, and myself, were constituted life members of the society. Collections and subscriptions during the day and evening amounted to all \$772.44. There are some noble spirits in Greenfield, and several examples of self-sacrifice and Christian liberality exhibited on that occasion, command our admiration. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The Rev. Mr. Partridge, of the Congregational Church, S. H. Reed, Esq., who presided at the meeting, and myself, were constituted life members of the society. Collections and subscriptions during the day and evening amounted to all \$772.44. There are some noble spirits in Greenfield, and several examples of self-sacrifice and Christian liberality exhibited on that occasion, command our admiration. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The Rev. Mr. Partridge, of the Congregational Church, S. H. Reed, Esq., who presided at the meeting, and myself, were constituted life members of the society. Collections and subscriptions during the day and evening amounted to all \$772.44. There are some noble spirits in Greenfield, and several examples of self-sacrifice and Christian liberality exhibited on that occasion, command our admiration. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The Rev. Mr. Partridge, of the Congregational Church, S. H. Reed, Esq., who presided at the meeting, and myself, were constituted life members of the society. Collections and subscriptions during the day and evening amounted to all \$772.44. There are some noble spirits in Greenfield, and several examples of self-sacrifice and Christian liberality exhibited on that occasion, command our admiration. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The Rev. Mr. Partridge, of the Congregational Church, S. H. Reed, Esq., who presided at the meeting, and myself, were constituted life members of the society. Collections and subscriptions during the day and evening amounted to all \$772.44. There are some noble spirits in Greenfield, and several examples of self-sacrifice and Christian liberality exhibited on that occasion, command our admiration. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The Rev. Mr. Partridge, of the Congregational Church, S. H. Reed, Esq., who presided at the meeting, and myself, were constituted life members of the society. Collections and subscriptions during the day and evening amounted to all \$772.44. There are some noble spirits in Greenfield, and several examples of self-sacrifice and Christian liberality exhibited on that occasion, command our admiration. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The Rev. Mr. Partridge, of the Congregational Church, S. H. Reed, Esq., who presided at the meeting, and myself, were constituted life members of the society. Collections and subscriptions during the day and evening amounted to all \$772.44. There are some noble spirits in Greenfield, and several examples of self-sacrifice and Christian liberality exhibited on that occasion, command our admiration. Among the converts are several young persons of superior intelligence and promise. Accessions by certificate and confession have increased our numbers at present to 65. Bro. Cox, of Westfield, spent the last Sabbath with us, and preached two practical and effective sermons upon the subject of Missions. In the evening, we held our general Missionary Meeting, at which addresses were delivered by Bro. Butler, of Williamsburg, Bro. Cox, and “your humble servant.” The

LITERARY ITEMS.

G. P. R. JAMES.—The Philadelphia Bulletin declares this gentleman's lectures an entire failure. They are so verbose that he never gets to the cream of his subject, but wears out his audience with minute and familiar detail, giving them neither originality or point.

A correspondent of the Buffalo Christian Advocate says that the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary during the last term had three hundred and fifty students, exclusive of the primary department. Many of the students experienced a change of heart during the session, and on a recent Sabbath, five received baptism.

During the past year five hundred students have attended the Oneida Conference Seminary.

A new periodical, called *The Randolph Macon Magazine*, is about to be established at that institution. The Magazine will be edited by a committee of six students, two from each literary society.

Poetry has proscribed in the Papal dominions, the works of Bacon, Paschal, Milton, Leibnitz, Desartes, Malebranche, Locke, Montesquieu, Kent, Bentham, and more lately, the works of M. Coquerel, the Protestant divine who voted generally with M. Montalembert, an English grammar of English, a geography, and several Greek and Latin dictionaries.

BISHOP BASCOM'S LIBRARY.—The editor of the Methodist Protestant says he has received a catalogue of books comprising the library of the late Bishop Bascom, of the M. E. Church. The books will be sold at auction in Lexington, Ky., on the 14th of January, 1851. Many of the volumes are among the best in the language; others are comparatively worthless, as is found to be the case in every large collection.

DEAR BRO. STEVENS.—I should like to see the following notice of Mr. Caughey's book, from Rev. Moses Hill, of the Maine Conference, in your excellent paper.

L. BATES.

"METHODISM IN EARNEST."

I have carefully read through the book with the above title, and contrary to my expectations have found it exceedingly interesting and edifying. It is indeed exceptional in several minor and not very important particulars, but really I can perceive no just grounds for the very serious charge that the hero of its story laid claim to an originality of thought which he did not possess. The author, Mr. Gwin, introduced a bill providing for a survey of the country, to be carried out to the Navy Department, was amended by an additional resolution that the Secretary of the Treasury report why the change should not be made, and that passed—24 to 16. Adjourned to Thursday.

HOUSE.—A bill was introduced and referred to pay the expenses of the construction and services of militia in the war last with Great Britain. The House discussed the Cheap Postage Bill, but no action was taken.

SENATE, Tuesday, Dec. 31.—Mr. Benton introduced a bill to accelerate sales of public lands, to pay the public, and to extinguish the federal title to public lands within the States—referred to Committee on Public Lands. A Committee to inquire into the expediency of establishing a Marine Hospital at Portland, Me. The correspondence between the State Department and Austria was received and referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE.—A joint resolution that nothing in the Boundary Land Act of 1850 shall be construed as to prevent the sale or transfer of any certificates or warrants prior to location. The passage of this resolution cannot fail to prevent the realization of the benefits, which it was supposed the bill would afford. The land granted under the act, instead of passing into the hands of the landowner, will, however, be subject to a claim for a large portion of public lands to be held in common until an exorbitant price can be obtained for them.

SENATE, Tuesday, Dec. 31.—Mr. Benton's resolution, calling on the Secretary of the Navy to report what advantages would be derived from surveying the survey of the coast of California. This was referred to the Navy Department, and was amended by an additional resolution that the Secretary of the Treasury report why the change should not be made, and that passed—24 to 16. Adjourned to Thursday.

HOUSE.—A bill was introduced and referred to pay the expenses of the construction and services of militia in the war last with Great Britain. The House discussed the Cheap Postage Bill, but no action was taken.

SENATE, Thursday, Jan. 2.—Mr. Walker presented a petition from forty-two citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law. Referred to Committee on Slavery.

Mr. Gwin introduced a bill providing for a survey of the country, to be carried out to the Navy Department.

The Senate then took up the general calendar, the first bill in order being that providing for the fortification of Ship Island, off the coast of Mississippi.

Mr. Davis explained the bill, and it was ordered to be engrossed.

The bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

On motion of Mr. Bright, the Senate took up Mr. Bright's bill, respecting the removals from California.

Mr. Gwin introduced a bill providing for a survey of the country, to be carried out to the Navy Department.

The bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright proceeded to address the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to the Senate in regard to the bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, and the bill granting a pension to H. H. Bodley, were severally considered and ordered for engrossment.

Mr. Bright's bill was referred to

## THE LIBERIA BEACON.

BY MARTIN F. TUFTON.

A thousand miles of rugged shore,  
And not a lighthouse seen!  
Alas, the thousand years of yore,  
That such a shame hath been!  
Alas, that Africa's darkling race,  
The savages and slaves,  
Never have known the gleam of grace  
On their south-western waves.

Never till now!—O glorious light!  
The beacon is ablaze,  
And half the horrors of the night  
Are scattered by its rays.  
Forth from the starry-heavened West  
Was lit the glowing torch;  
For dear Columbia's sons have blest  
Liberia with—a church!

Yes, yours, Columbia, leads the way,  
And shows our hard, old world  
How slavery, in the sight of day,  
Can easily be down-hurled!  
Not by the bloody hand of power,  
That mangles while it fives,  
But by religion's calmer hand,  
And freedom of the seas.

Yes, brothers, patience is the word—  
And prudence in your zeal;  
Where these sweet angels well are heard,  
They work the common weal.  
The North must wait, the South be wise,  
And both unite in love,  
To help the slave beneath the skies,  
Who is no *sla*ve.

—Colonization Herald.

## ALL'S WELL.

The clouds which rise with thunder, slake  
Our thirsty souls with rain;  
The blow most dread falls to break  
From off our limbs a chain;  
Our very sins and follies make  
The love of God more plain;  
As through the shadowy lens of even,  
The eye looks farthest into heaven—  
On gleams of sun and depths of blue  
The glaring sunshine never knew.

—National Era. J. G. W.

## SLAVERY.

For the Herald and Journal.

## THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

MR. EDITOR:—In the Herald of Dec. 4, I read a communication addressed to Rev. C. A. Adams, and signed Wm. C. Prescott, which were it a professed lawyer's plea, might pass among the mass for what it is worth; but in the Herald, with no remark to point out its fallacies, it may pass among careless readers for more than its value, because it is in good company.

With your leave, I propose to review some of his assertions and arguments, and endeavor to show their real relation to fact and truth.

Near the commencement of his article he says, "I have been taught to believe, and as yet have seen nothing to shake that belief, that jurisdiction over the subject of slavery is not one of the grants made by the States to the General Government." Yet his whole article is an attempt to vindicate the exercise of that jurisdiction by the General Government, and he even attempts to prove by the Constitution of the United States the inconsistency of his belief and the falsity of the position he has assumed.

He then goes on to say, "I am aware that the framers of the Constitution or their contemporaries, very soon after its adoption, entered upon the solemn work of legislation" upon this subject, which was beyond their jurisdiction; "and that the provision then made has stood unimpaired upon the statute book for more than half a century, and he might have added in most of the free States a dead letter. Its enforcement was once attempted and abandoned, in Massachusetts, and the attempt will probably never be repeated.

Again: he says, "We all know that although constitutional in its provisions," this attempted "jurisdiction on the subject of slavery" "was operative in the North," by reason of the repugnance of popular sympathy. Will he deny that that sympathy arose from the fact that any person might, upon the allegation of being a fugitive from service, be deprived of the right of trial by jury, the dartest right reserved to us by the Constitution, and be delivered by the judge a slave to an irresponsible individual, to be carried whers his soul and body will sell for the most money.

The people thought the Constitution imperfect till it guaranteed in express terms that the right to be secure from unreasonable seizure shall not be violated. That no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law. And that in suits of common law, where the value in controversy exceeds twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. Is it strange that a law annulling the right of trial by jury was ineptive by reason of public sympathy?

Passing away a column of remark upon the terms Constitution, Confederation, Preamble, &c., he says again of the Constitution, "In no respect" does the provision for the delivery of fugitives from service "differ" from that providing for the delivery of persons charged with crime. Let us appeal to the instrument. Art. iv, sec. 2, clause 2, reads:—

"A person charged in any State with treason, felony or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime."

The person then is to be delivered up to the high authority of a responsible State executive, bound by oath to allow him a trial by an impartial jury; to inform him of the nature and cause of the accusation; to allow him to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to allow him to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel to aid in his defense. Such is the provision for the delivery of persons charged with crime.

What is the provision which differs in no respect from this? We find it in clause 3:—

"No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation thereof, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered upon claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

This then provides that a debtor shall be delivered up to his creditor to an irresponsible person, not for trial, but for perpetual servitude.

Thus we see one provision is predicated upon a charge of crime, the other upon a *fact of debt*. One upon a charge which the law considers false; till proved true; the other upon the legal certainty which can be known only from previous legal investigation. Yet this expounder of the Constitution says, "In no respect do they differ." One is to be delivered up to the Governor of a State to be brought before an impartial jury; the other is to be delivered up to a private individual to be carried to the slave market, or where else he pleases. In no respect do they differ, while Congress has left one to be executed by the State Governments as they see fit, and made the other the foundation of author-

ity for legislation by Congress for depriving any citizen of the right of trial by jury upon a mere *claim of debt*!

The advocates of slavery have long told us, "In no respect do they differ." While one is a necessary preliminary to a trial, and the other a consequence of a fact which must have been previously ascertained. One is a primary process; the other an execution of judgment.

We will next consider his remarks on the habeas corpus. Addressing Mr. A. he says, "But you say that here is a suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. As do you not indicate the terms of this suspension, I confess I cannot tell in what manner to meet your declaration on that point," and somewhat impulsively asserts that clerical dignity alone saves Mr. A. from being perhaps annihilated by his ridicule. He then proceeds: "I will ask a single question. The writ of habeas corpus is a constitutional writ, and stands unimpaired as long as the Constitution stands. Now how can this constitutional writ be suspended by a legislative enactment in which not the slightest allusion is made to it?" Now I am no lawyer, but have supposed that the writ of habeas corpus is a *process* by which any person holding another person prisoner may be required to show by what authority or right such person is held, and whether that authority be valid.

I have always understood the word *writ* to mean a *legal process*, and find high authority for the opinion.

Now the Fugitive Slave Law says in sec. 6: "And the certificates — shall be conclusive of the right of such person or persons — to remove such fugitive to the State or territory from which he escaped, and shall prevent all molestation of said person or persons by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate or other person whomsoever."

If then, as I suppose, the writ of habeas corpus be not only a constitutional provision, but a legal process issued by a court or judge, then these certificates issued by the lowest judicial officer known to the law suspend it. "But, says Mr. P., "the writ of habeas corpus stands unimpaired while the Constitution stands." Then the Fugitive Slave Law is null and void, and Mr. P. is guilty of the heinous crime he charges on Mr. Adams,—rank *nullification*.

No wonder he could not tell how to meet Mr. A.'s declaration! And how will he meet his own assertion made under the form of interrogation that the Fugitive Slave Law contained not the slightest allusion to the writ of habeas corpus?

"But," says Mr. P., "the law of 1793 has stood *unimpaired* on the *statute book*, though it could not be enforced," and of course a constitutional provision may remain unimpaired on the *statute book*, though its exercise be suspended by a law of Congress. Surely such a lawyer can meet anything. If, as he asserts, the Fugitive Slave Law can be enforced, do not the certificates suspend every process that can be issued against the persons to whose favor they may be granted. Though obtained by perjury, the perjurer cannot be molested by warrant, indictment or capias, till with his victim he is beyond the reach of pursuit. Do such enactments come within the meaning of the Constitution? As much does the law which makes death the penalty of murder provide for Lynch execution as the Constitution of the United States provide for the delivery of any person as a fugitive from slavery till he is declared such in open court by an impartial jury; and whoever says I have no right to object to the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law till I am willing to become a constitutional slave catcher, might as truly say that I have no right to object to lynching till I am willing to become hangman for the whole country.

As I have never seen the law of 1793, I shall not attempt either to justify or condemn it, or to point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be*, and upon the introduction of further evidence, if it point out any difference or agreement between that "Act" and "An act to amend an act supplementary to" that act. Mr. P. is somewhat ambiguous, but I think he means to be understood that "Not a single point of difference can be discovered by the most astute critic between the two acts, except that one can be enforced, and the other could not."

If the law of 1793 authorized the seizure of a person without process, and delivery to perpetual bondage without trial, without even a hearing, not authorizing even the hearing of anything but the *case of the claimant*, and requiring a summary decision to preclude all opportunity for any defense; if it authorize the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the certificate of a commissioner appointed professedly to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves; if it enacts that a description made with such *concurrent certainty as may be*, (and fitting perhaps equally every tenth person of a whole race,) *may be</*